

## LIVING CREATIVELY AND JOYOUSLY

By Kirby Page

"The Lord made man a beautiful, breathing instrument of music, whereupon the spirit of life makes melody to God," exclaimed Clement of Alexandria many centuries ago. Man is a beast with his feet mired in the clay, but he is also a spirit who wings his way to communion with the Eternal, in poetry and art and music, in science and philosophy and theology, in fervent prayer and consecrated behavior and redemptive fellowship. The religious faith is that man is a spiritual being because he is created in the spiritual image of the Supreme Being. Therefore an individual can never be his true self so long as he refuses to rise above the animal-level of physical appetite and self-centered sensations.

Discipline is required for fullness of life, discipline of body and mind and spirit. The practice of the presence of God is required of all who would develop and release their full powers. Training in awareness and recognition is essential. The Christian faith is that God reveals himself in nature, in creatures, in persons, especially in prophets and saints, and uniquely in Jesus. Keen realization that "this is my Father's world" is needed if an individual is to achieve his best.

The surpassing beauty of a sunset should not only be enjoyed, it should be recognized as the handiwork of God. A person can train himself to such a degree that sensitiveness to the glories of nature automatically brings God into mind. Nature in its myriad forms of beauty should ever be recognized: the awe-inspiring majesty of the starry firmament; the indescribable blending of color at dawn; the sinking of a flaming ball of fire into the horizon at sunset; fleecy clouds floating through the heavens; fog, rain, snow; rhododendrons, poppies, roses; an orchard at blossomtime; silvery

reflections on a calm lake lined with green trees; the resistless onward surge of a mighty river; the raging torrent of a mountain stream; the reverent silence of majestic trees.

It is good for the spirit of man to experience beauty:

Here is peace and loveliness ever mingled;  
Organ music of winds and birds and branches,  
And a brooding Presence that makes each moment  
A benediction.

(Thomas S. Jones, Jr., Shadow of the Perfect Rose,  
Published by Farrar & Rinehart, New York City.)

Music is a window to fuller life. Harmony stirs the soul of man, quickens imagination, heightens aspiration, and forges determination. Wise is the individual who arranges his time with hours for great music and who has trained the faculty of recognition, recognition of harmony as a revelation of God. Carl Sandburg tells of the man who went to a concert tired and discouraged and who came away transformed: "When he got outside his heels hit the sidewalk a new way. He was the same man in the same world as before. Only there was a singing fire and a climb of roses everlastingly over the world he looked on." (Chicago Poems. Published by Henry Holt and Company, New York City.)

Training in recognition of persons is essential to the highest creativity and the profoundest joy; recognition of persons as possessing inherent and priceless worth, created in the spiritual image of the Eternal; recognition of persons as kinsmen, beloved members of God's one family. After witnessing an accident where a young woman was knocked unconscious by a reckless driver, I exclaimed to my wife: "I didn't recognize her!" If I had recognized the unconscious victim as our own daughter, the entire scene would have been revolutionized. So would all life be revolutionized if constantly we were able to recognize persons, all persons, as precious members of our own family. Revolutionized indeed would be homelife, race relations, economic affairs, international relations, if men were trained in recognition. When on a bus you observe an individual of another race, reflect upon the fact that this man's life is precious beyond computation,



to himself, to his loved ones, and to God; think about the meaning of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and in that moment prayer will be a reality.

Prayer is indeed the soul's sincere desire, and the practice of the presence of God ennobles desire, changes behavior, and transforms relationships. Many times a day pray short prayers of affirmation, adoration, thanksgiving, penitence, commitment, determination, and thereby growth in creativity will be nourished. Develop the habit of thinking about God immediately upon awakening; thank Him before every meal; remember Him often during the day; turn consciously to Him before sleeping at night.

Sustained periods of silence and meditation are essential to the good life. Momentary prayer is not sufficient. We must also expose ourselves unhurriedly to God. If he is to direct our thinking, stir our emotions, guide our conscience, and strengthen our will, he must have uninterrupted access to our inner lives at frequent intervals. Fifteen minutes of quietness and privacy for prayer is a bare minimum subsistence level; half an hour is not enough; an hour daily is really required for fulness of life.

Such a period of silent meditation may often be devoted to expressions of gratitude. Count your blessings, name them over one by one, and see what God has done and what countless individuals have done to enrich your own life. Think of the manifold material blessings that have come from God's bountiful nature, and give thanks. Reflect upon your physical endowment. Praise God for health and vitality, or at least thank him for an indomitable spirit that lives joyously in spite of affliction and pain. Contemplate the inestimable boon of capacity to appreciate beauty and enjoy music. Dwell on the unlimited range of abstract thought open to the human mind. Think of what it means to love and be loved. Thank God for interdependence and the cords that bind us to other people. Remember

the extent of indebtedness: to myriads of workers for sustenance and shelter and clothing, for comfort and convenience and privilege; to men and women of long ago who helped to create the heritage we now enjoy - discoverers, inventors, scientists, hewers of wood, potters molding their clay, laborers with crushing burdens, artists, sculptors, printers, physicians, surgeons, musicians, philosophers, teachers, authors, statesmen, administrators, executives, preachers, saints, martyrs. Praise God for companionship, and for the joy of living as a beloved friend. Exult over the radiance of everlasting life. Praise the Lord as long as you live.

Spend much time in confession. See yourself as you really are; see yourself as you are seen by the ever-present God. Contrast the actual with the ideal, and cry out to God for vision and strength to live more worthily. Spend unhurried moment in intercession for others. Yearn over your loved ones and friends. Send out thoughts and prayers of affection and concern and commitment. Remember that the greatest souls of the ages have ardently practiced intercession.

Become better acquainted with Jesus. Study the Bible record more thoroughly. Read illuminating interpretations of his life and teaching. Recognize him as the supreme revelation of the nature of God and also the fullest revelation of the possibilities of man. Make renewed commitments of self to him, to his interpretation of God, and to his way of life. Live today with the realization that you are already living in God's home, and seek to be a worthy member of God's family.

O Light that followeth all my way,  
 I yield my flickering torch to Thee;  
 My heart restores its borrowed ray,  
 That in Thy sunshine blaze its day  
 May richer, fuller be.  
 (George Matheson, 1842-1906)



ADDRESSES BY MR. KIRBY PAGE

and MR. PITMAN POTTER

AT THE EMERGENCY PEACE CAMPAIGN, SYMPOSIUM

SHERMAN HOTEL, CHICAGO, APRIL 22, 1937

12:15 O'CLOCK P. M.

---

**SAMUEL M. MORGAN**  
SHORTHAND REPORTER AND NOTARY PUBLIC  
1301-S, 155 NORTH CLARK ST.  
CHICAGO  
TELEPHONES ( DEARBORN 3268  
CENTRAL 1470

EMERGENCY PEACE CAMPAIGN, SYMPOSIUM

SHERMAN HOTEL, CHICAGO

APRIL 22, 1937

12:15 P. M.

- Subject: 1 - Should the United States, as a last resort, go to war to preserve democracy in Europe and Asia?
- 2 - How can the United States, without going to war, help to diminish belligerency in Europe and Asia and thus promote world peace?
- 

THE CHAIRMAN: (Mr. Adlai Stevenson) Ladies and Gentlemen: Many of you will recall a familiar and classic conversation between President Coolidge and Mrs. Coolidge on Sunday morning when the President returned after attending church. Mrs. Coolidge said: "Did you enjoy the sermon?" And the President casually replied in the affirmative.

There being guests present, she saw the possibility of conversation on the subject, and Mrs. Coolidge renewed the conversation and said: "Well, Calvin, what was the text?" To which the President replied: "Sin."



d2

Not deterred, she renewed the attack and said: "Well, Calvin, what did the minister say about it?" To which the President replied: "He is against it." (Laughter)

I think, I suspect, that all of us can agree that we are against war, and perhaps even more readily than we could agree about sin. But unfortunately being against war has not a very good record for preventing war. And this month we are vividly reminded of that untoward predicament in which we found ourselves just twenty years ago, when after three long years of being against war, and merely insisting upon the observation of our so-called neutral rights, we found ourselves in war.

In short, with the world preparing for war three or four times as fast today as it was twenty years ago, it seems to me it is high time that the American people give some careful thought to the difficulty, paradoxically, of doing whatever one wants to do, namely avoid war.

And this, I take it, is precisely what the Emergency Peace Campaign is attempting to do in a very brief interval of time; to promote

discussion and interest in the intricate problem of the preservation of peace, to the end, the primary end, that our policies, domestically and nationally, may be fathered in deliberate and intelligent discussion; and to the end that the peace activities of various organizations throughout the United States may produce agreement of opinion as to what our policy, domestically and internationally, should be.

So I deem it a privilege and a pleasure to be here today, and to have some small part in this symposium, and for two reasons:

In the first place, I am convinced that the growth of modern technique in propaganda in the emotional field makes it essential to enlarge public education, if democracy is to survive, at least to succeed.

And, secondly, because of the presence of Mr. Potter and Mr. Kirby Page, we are afforded a very rare opportunity to hear something from authoritative sources of the conflict, or rather contrasting approaches and feelings in the peace movement.

I refer to the collective security



principle enforced by sanctions, as opposed to neutrality and no foreign war.

This symposium is designed, not so much to contrast differences in the two approaches as it is to accentuate the agreements.

The first speaker, Mr. Kirby Page, has had intimate and long familiarity with the problems of international organizations.

He has been well known in this country, and well respected, for many years as an author, editor, publicist, lecturer; his acquaintance throughout the world is extraordinary; and his contributions to social reform and to the religious thought of our times are not inconsiderable.

Mr. Page.

(Applause)

ADDRESS BY MR. KIREY PAGE

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a pleasure for me to participate in this kind of a discussion, because I believe in gatherings where different points of view are presented at the same time.

Too often our meetings are meetings made up of people of like minds, who listen to speakers with which they agree. And too infrequently do we have gatherings made up of people who themselves differ fundamentally, and who listen sympathetically, and with an effort to gain insight, to speakers who present varying emphases.

The Emergency Peace Campaign has been committed to this method from the beginning, and if you look at the list of some three hundred speakers, who have given time and energy to the campaign, you will discover among those three hundred persons almost every kind of point of view to be found in the peace movement.

Just at this moment, for example, Dr. Raymond Leslie Buell and Mr. Frederick J. Libby, whose points of view are not identical, are tour-



ing the Pacific Coast under the auspices of the Emergency Peace Campaign. And from San Diego to Seattle, Mr. Libby and Dr. Buell are shedding light, I hope, more than heat.

That we believe to be a sound procedure.

We are committed to the exploration of the extremely important issue from varying angles.

Let me add, in a long parenthesis, even in this brief discussion, a parenthesis that has to do with an extremely important meeting that was held last Monday under the combined auspices of the National Peace Conference and the Emergency Peace Campaign.

At this all-day meeting of these two bodies, the day was spent in exploring the possibility of reaching a much more unified and better centralized peace movement.

Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick made the opening presentation on Monday, and for a half hour pleaded for a more inclusive, a more cosmopolitan peace movement, rather than sectarian divisions within the movement.

After considerable discussion, where many points of view were presented, a motion was

made by Mr. Clark Eichelberger, of the League of Nations Association, to the effect that the National Peace Conference be transformed into an executive as well as a coordinating peace movement.

Mr. Eichelberger's motion was passed unanimously by the members of the National Peace Conference.

A committee, a comprehensive, representative committee was appointed by the National Peace Conference to explore this possibility of transforming the National Peace Conference itself into an executive peace movement, as well as a coordinating peace agency.

That committee is to have a two-day session on May 12 and 13, and many of us look forward with extreme expectancy to the outcome of that committee meeting, the report of which will be referred to the National Peace Conference for action a month hence, at its May meeting.

I have taken these moments, because in a gathering like this procedure is almost as important as content in discussion of the future of the peace movement.

Now, we have two questions before us



today. With regard to the question as to whether the United States, as a last resort, should ever consent or ever be willing to engage in a war in Europe or Asia, in an endeavor to preserve democracy; and the second question that is listed on the card you all see, which has to do with the method of reducing the likelihood that there will be a general war, what could the United States do in this regard, to reduce the belligerency of Germany, Italy and Japan, I want to express a categorical negative as my point of view with regard to the first question.

It is my deep conviction that the United States has no business sending armed troops to any other continent for any purpose whatsoever.

(Applause)

Therefore I take the position, upon which I think there will be agreement, substantial agreement in this room that, because of the nature and the unavoidable consequences of war in its modern form, that the United States should say categorically, and mean it, that we are not going to participate as a nation, as a people, in any armed hostilities on any other continent.

We are not discussing in this connection what we would do if the soil of the United States should be invaded by a hostile foe. That is a subject, an extremely important question, but that is a question for consideration on another occasion.

What I am speaking about now is this idea of a foreign war. The Emergency Peace Campaign, as many of you know, has been sponsoring this crusade which is now in progress across the nation, in an endeavor to get the American people to face up to this question, and in so far as their convictions enable them to do so, say without any qualification, and without any equivocation: We are opposed to the participation by the government of the United States in any war in Europe or in Asia.

Now under some conditions, under some circumstances, it might be worth while taking a lot of time to put content into one's answer; to give detail as to why. I will not do that, because the time is short; and there are other things that I want to say.

Briefly it is this, that is back of this conclusion. When you look at the nature of war as it is waged now, you realize -- we all do -- that

war has itself come to be totalitarian.

War now is a combat of peoples, of populations against other peoples and other populations.

War is now waged, as we all know, with all the instruments of destruction and annihilation that have been placed at our disposal by science.

And when you put together those two factors, the totalitarian character of war in the future, that it engulfs whole populations, and that it is waged with every conceivable weapon of destruction,- that combination makes war the kind of an instrument that cannot be wisely and safely used, no matter what the objective in sight may be.

We go on and say, not only the nature of war, but the predictable consequences of a war waged by the United States in Europe or Asia, that war would be costly, not only in money, not only in human life; that war for the United States would be costly in terms of liberty.

If one can say, with a great deal of assurance based upon the evidence, that if war is totalitarian in its essence, if it is waged with all the devices that science has put forth for our disposal, you may be sure that the successful



administration of that kind of a war, on that scale, requires dictatorship for its success.

Therefore, if a nation goes to war on the scale that is required now, the nation that makes that decision does force a dictatorship.

Nations that go to war are bound to transform themselves into dictatorships.

Some of us believe, therefore, that the effort to achieve and to conserve these high values should be such that when we talk about the possibility of going to war, we believe that the instrument at our disposal in the form of war is of such a nature, and the consequences are inherently of such a character, that an endeavor to achieve high, holy ends in that way, by that instrument, is doomed to failure.

And therefore we say that even though the objective held up before us is the preservation of democracy - we say firmly: You cannot preserve democracy by transforming yourself into a dictatorship.

And our minds are carried back twenty years to the slogans of the World War. We were going to end militarism. We were going to make

the world safe for democracy.

Well now, the evidence is clear and conclusive that we cannot end militarism by militarizing the world. And we cannot conserve and protect democracy by transforming it into a dictatorship.

So with all possible vigor we say: No, the government of the United States has no business sending its armed troops to Europe or Asia, no matter what the objective may be; that we know in advance the end of that war and the consequences of that war, and we say that way, the war way, is not the way to conserve these values and to preserve democracy.

We believe it is extremely important to get the American people to say that, and to say it with vigor.

It is for that reason that we are endeavoring, all across this country, in as many hundreds of communities as possible, to get the maximum number of people thinking in terms of the significance of this problem; getting them to make up their minds, and if their minds are made up along the line I have indicated, we believe that there is a tremendous value in having the American people stand up and say aloud,

cry aloud from the housetops: No foreign war; no participation by the government of this nation in any war waged on the continent of Europe or the continent of Asia.

We believe that the saying of that itself is significant as a means of helping to get a mind steady; as a means of helping to stabilize emotions; as a possible contribution to the withstanding of the instruments of propaganda and hysteria that may sweep across us in some hour of crisis.

And we have said, over and over again, there would be little use of a campaign of this sort, of a no foreign war crusade, if all we said in the crusade was something like what I have been saying; if all we said was that we will not support, we will not engage in a war, a foreign war, and stop there.

Those of us in the Emergency Peace Campaign would regard that, not only as futile, but as perilous, as dangerous.

Therefore we go on to discuss this second question.

The second question has to do with ways and means of dealing with the belligerency, the militancy of the three nations now regarded as the



disturbers of the peace.

Everybody knows now that those three nations are looked upon by most of the other nations as the aggressors, as the militant nations, belligerent nations.

Now, how do you deal with them? For myself, my answer is a double answer.

The first way you deal with the belligerency of those three militant nations is by bringing about changes, bringing about changes that will relieve the economic and the psychological tensions under which the governments and the peoples of those lands are laboring today.

You must make change. If you do not make change, our opinion is you will not avert war and any distress that will come from war.

You must make two kinds of changes, or you must make changes which bring about two results. You must make changes that bring about economic benefits to the peoples of those militant nations.

And you must make changes which change the feelings, which relieve the pent-up emotions of those people.

Our feeling is that unless changes are

made that achieve economic and emotional results, everything else we do will be futile.

Now what is the nature of the change?

The change that is most needed is that those peoples of those handicapped countries should be able to sell their goods, and to sell their goods in the rich purchasing markets of the earth.

The one change which would do more than any other change, as I see it, would be just that.

If Germany and Italy and Japan could, with more freedom and more advantage, sell larger quantities of their commodities, that ability to sell would increase their ability to buy; and their increased ability to buy and sell would increase their economic welfare. And that increase in economic welfare would diminish the desperation which is now urging them into these extreme measures.

But economic changes will not themselves do what is required, unless those economic changes are accompanied by results which tend to relieve the feelings.

Now, in a brief discussion like this is, all I can do is to refer to the problem.

It is obvious to anybody who has thought

about it that the people of Germany, and to a lesser degree the people of the other two nations, have been laboring these years under an intense emotional convulsion, which has been produced by the conviction that they are the victims of gross injustice; that they are the victims of oppression.

Now, when the people feel deeply, passionately, that they are the victims of very flagrant miscarriages of justice, and that feeling comes upon them at a time when they are in economic distress, the combination of economic misery and outraged feelings, that combination is responsible for the belligerency, the militancy of these three nations.

Nothing is going to do us any good that fails to make the economic changes that will relieve this desperate condition and that will relieve their feelings.

But that is not enough; bringing about changes is not enough. The bringing about changes will not be possible unless the other thing is done, and therefore we are expressing the significance of world organization.

We are stressing the need for building and making use of international agencies of justice.



It is easy to jump to the conclusion that a crusade that labels itself, "A no foreign war crusade" is in its nature isolationist.

And nothing could be further from the truth, in so far as the Emergency Peace Campaign attitude is concerned than that.

The Emergency Peace Campaign is not isolationist. Speaking for myself, I am not isolationist, but quite and emphatically the reverse of that.

For many years now, ever since the League of Nations was formed, I have myself made endless speeches in terms of commitment to the League of Nations. I have been pro-League of Nations from the beginning, and I am pro-League of Nations at this moment. And there has never been a moment when I was in any other frame of mind.

Some of my friends say I have spoken on this subject ad nauseum. At any rate, that has been and still is my position.

Now, what kind of a league of nations is required to bring about the economic changes and the political changes that will relieve economic distress, and will change these explosive feelings?

I will illustrate it by commenting briefly upon three Articles of the Covenant.

The League of Nations that I believe in is a League of Nations that puts its primary emphasis on Article XIX.

The League of Nations I believe in is a League of Nations that puts a minor emphasis on Article X.

And the League of Nations I believe in is a League of Nations that puts no emphasis at all upon the armed sanctions element in Article XVI.

Let me say that again. Article XIX is the one I believe in. It is the article that opens up the way for the League to take the initiative in bringing about changes.

It is that article that has been ignored in the main by the League, and it is the ignoring of that Article XIX, more than any other single factor, that is responsible for the relative impotence of the League now.

The League up to this point has put more emphasis upon Article X and upon Article XVI. And it is that undue preoccupation with Article X and Article XVI that is responsible, in my opinion,

for the comparative impotence of the League.

This League of Nations that is primarily for the purpose of preserving the status quo - Article X; and a League of Nations that is committed to the preservation of the status quo by threats of punitive action - Article XVI - in the kind of world in which we are living, a League of Nations that puts its emphasis primarily upon Article X and Article XVI is an impotent league in the crisis, and evidence will bear me out.

Now, perhaps one of the most competent spokesmen on this point is the man who for many years was head of the limitation of arms or Disarmament Section of the League.

In a very revealing discussion of this problem recently in the New York Times Mr. Madariaga commented upon this aspect of the League.

Now nobody would accuse him of being isolationist; and nobody would accuse him of being anti-League of Nations. Therefore, let me read to you a short paragraph which I think comes to grips more quickly than anything that has been written, and has more clarity in its essence.

Here is what Madariaga says:



"Now that sixteen years of experience have enriched our thoughts at the expense of our hopes, we are in a position to realize that precisely in this punitive twist which events gave to the covenant lies the chief cause of its relative failures.

"The essence of the covenant is world cooperation by all nations. But the text bears the deep traces of the terrible ordeal which most of the nations responsible for it had just undergone. And thus, while the spirit of the covenant is relegated to the preamble, and appears at its best in Article XI - the only article in the covenant which is from the hand of President Wilson, Lord Cecil dixit - most of the rest of it is inspired by fear of war and seeks less to prevent it than to punish it."

And it is precisely in this punitive twist that we find the chief cause of its failure, relative failure.

Therefore I stand up and say, and I speak only as an advocate of collective security - I believe world collective security that rests upon armed sanctions is not security at all; that the

only kind of collective security that secures is a League of Nations which is primarily concerned with that which underlies Article XIX; and in a minor way, is concerned with Article X; and in no way at all with the punitive element in Article XVI.

Now, the concluding thing I want to say is this: It is a matter of tactics with regard to getting the United States into the League of Nations.

There are many reasons why the United States is not a member of the League. The main one is this: The chief reason why the United States is not now a member of the League is found in the refusal of the American people to do what they believed was inherent, but which is not necessarily so - the refusal of the American people to be participants in the policing of Europe.

The American people are not in the mood to police Europe, and if going into the League of Nations means we must police Europe, we will stay out of the League.

If you want to get the United States to enter most fully into the spirit of international action, the one prerequisite of that is to get out

of the minds of the American people that they have any share in, or any responsibility for, policing Europe, or policing Asia.

If you could remove from the covenant the punitive element which has been its chief cause of failure, and put the emphasis upon world-wide cooperation to bring about changes which will bring economic relief, and emotional relief, it is the League of Nations that exalts Article XIX that the American people will join. (Applause)

MR. MC KINNEY: Ladies and Gentlemen: It is my part of this program to offer you a privilege, the privilege of participation. And in order that it may conform to the conventional pattern, there will be ushers passing you some cards; and I hope they will do so at once and get the cards out while I am speaking, not only to the tables, but to the people in the gallery and the people around the room.

In offering you this privilege, we realize it has been offered to you, to a good many of you before; a number of you at the George Hensbury meeting in Orchestra Hall last spring, and probably more at the Maude Royden meeting in Orchestra Hall



this fall, to participate in the work of the Emergency Peace Campaign.

We do not want to duplicate that effort, and those who have responded may close your ears to the rest. But we do not want to miss anyone who did not respond at either one of those meetings, who is here today.

Of course we would not decline anyone who wanted to add to what they have done before, but that is not what we are addressing ourselves to at this moment. We do not want to embarrass them with high pressure salesmanship.

Speaking of the word "pressure", there are some good friends in our own organization who have expressed themselves as resenting emotional appeals in peace movements and other movements.

My friends, all I can say in that respect is, if you do not want to be oppressed by high pressure emotional appeals, by all means avoid war, because there is no high pressure salesmanship, or high emotional appeal that begins to touch the fringes of the sort of thing that comes when you go to war, with conscription, volunteering, sales of liberty bonds under high pressure, and what-not.

The Emergency Peace Campaign is a movement inaugurated by the American Friends Service Committee to meet an emergency; not a long term, permanent organization, but one that is here for an aggressive and definite piece of work now.

It is a campaign to do a very definite and simplified task.

Now, as has been said here already today, there is not any of us, in or out of this room, who is not for peace. The most ardent advocates of military preparedness give as the basis of their whole reasoning that that is, in their consideration, and undoubtedly honestly, the best means to secure peace.

So, as a people we are a hundred per cent for peace. There is no difference between us on that score; the only difference is the route by which we achieve it. There we split up into sectarianism, as Mr. Page says.

As a matter of fact, I believe there are as many as forty or fifty peace organizations, which are seeking the remedy for war and the securing of peace. And that is unfortunate.

The Emergency Peace Campaign has come into

the field to try and discover the highest common denominator between these various peace organizations, declare it in a simplified sort of a way; go out with an aggressive campaign, not only to the large cities but the small communities and the countryside; enlisting students and others for this sort of campaign during their vacation period in the summer.

They are emphasizing the common ground that there is between the different peace organizations, and bringing it to a definite, outspoken, conscious head to crystallize, simplify and solidify public opinion.

What is contributed to the Emergency Peace Campaign is divided into three equal parts. One-third goes to the national organization at Philadelphia; one-third goes to the local organization in this community; and one-third goes to the area of which this community is the center, taking in the adjacent states.

Now, may I just pause for a moment while you give consideration to this card? There are four ways in which you can make your contribution. You can make it on the spot now. Cash now is



always desirable. I never saw anybody who would not accept it, I think.

There are three other ways, if they are more convenient to you. Will you give it just a moment's consideration?

Now, while the ushers are gathering up these pledge cards, let me say there will be another opportunity as you pass out the door; but I should like to have them pass among the tables and get those cards that you have ready at this time.

Let me just bring home to you these two or three considerations: We are not going to have peace without a price. It will not come by wishful thinking. It will not come by any introspective method. It can only come as some of us are deliberately willing to pay a price for it.

While we have been in this room, the two hours while occupied in this room, will cover an expenditure by the United States government in preparation of war of a quarter of a million dollars.

The Emergency Peace Campaign is asking for a million dollars and is on the way to its

achievement.

A battleship costs forty million dollars. We are asking for one-fortieth the cost of a battleship to carry on this peace work.

On this day, which marks the annual students' strike against war, there is an opportunity for those of us who are in this room, though not students, to participate in this effective way in helping the work of the Emergency Peace Campaign.

There is a lot that could be said in an emotional way, but again I come back to this fact, that we are here to view this situation objectively, not emotionally.

But it is only by directing our attention to it with some sense of conviction and some passion that we can avoid the far worse passionate hysteria that comes under the high pressure salesmanship of war.

THE CHAIRMAN: I agree with Mr. McKinney that it does not seem wholly unreasonable while emotions are being spent to do what no one wants to do, it is not extravagant to spend effectively to preserve peace.

The next speaker, Dr. Pitman Potter, has

long been a student of the post-war international organizations, and as a result of his mature experience is an adherent to the system of collective security.

Mr. Potter has taught at Harvard, at Yale and is now visiting professor at the University of Chicago.

Since 1931, he has been professor of international organizations at the Institute of Advanced International Studies at Geneva; and has written and lectured widely in the field of international law and international organizations.

During the eventful summer of 1935, he was legal adviser to the government of Ethiopia.

Dr. Potter.

(Applause)



ADDRESS BY MR. PITMAN POTTER

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am very glad that it was made clear earlier that both Mr. Page and myself come here not as advocates of war in any proper sense of the term. I do not rise myself specifically to move a resolution that we declare war on anybody. And I hope that what I have to say will not leave any misapprehension on this particular point. I am sure that it will not.

With your permission, I am going to read what I have to say because I have a good many points which I have to cover, and I think probably in view of the brevity of the time that will serve the purpose very much better.

Before taking up the substance of what I have to say, I should like to make clear two points which might otherwise be misunderstood, concerning my own position.

The first is that I am speaking here today entirely as a private person, and not on behalf of any association, government or international organization.

I have no connection at the present time

with any government, American, European, African or Asiatic. And I have not, and never have had, any connection with the League of Nations.

I speak as an individual student and teacher of international relations, and as nothing else.

The second is that while I shall have some pretty harsh things to say upon the question before us, and the program of the Emergency Peace Campaign in general, I am doing so with the full knowledge and consent of those who have arranged this meeting. And I say this now because I do not wish to seem to abuse their hospitality, to take them by surprise.

Two questions are stated for discussion today.

One, should the United States, as a last resort - I suppose that means even as a last resort - go to war to preserve democracy in Europe and Asia?

And, two, how can the United States, without going to war, help to diminish the belligerency in Europe and Asia, and thus promote world peace?

If I had to answer the first question just as it is stated, I should certainly answer

"No." I assume that by the question is meant: Go to war to prevent Fascism being imposed upon some democratic country, or possibly to restore democracy in Germany, Italy, Japan. I suppose that is what the framers of the question had in mind.

My reasons for the negative answer are that the type of regime which a country maintains cannot properly or successfully be dictated from outside; and that any such action would lack all international legal basis, and constitute aggressive war in the true sense; and be indeed equivalent to armed Fascist or Communist intervention itself.

Incidentally, I disagree with all this classification of countries as democracy versus Fascist versus Communist; but I cannot go into that now.

On the other hand, I regard the question as academic and misleading. I cannot conceive this country contemplating the action described. Even if we were to contemplate military action to prevent conquest of some democratic country by some Fascist or Communist country, it would be on the international ground of preventing aggression



or conquest.

What is more important still, the action need not, and almost certainly would not, be war in an honest sense of that term, but in essence, if not in form, international police action; that is, would not be an attack by one nation upon another for selfish national ends, but restraint applied to an aggressor for defense of common international principles.

Inasmuch as I do not believe we have to face this alternative in any case, that elaboration may be superfluous, but I want to at the beginning mark this difference between war and police action.

At this point I should like to revise the question itself, but let us turn to the second question before doing that.

I should answer the second question, what could the United States do, thus: "By a combined program of support for collective security action together with revision, either under the auspices of the League of Nations or apart from that body."

This might or might not involve military action - probably not, as I shall argue in a moment - but in any case would not involve war in any honest

sense of that term.

It seems, however, that it would be better at this point to state the fundamental errors, as I regard them, of the analysis and program of the Emergency Peace Campaign. In that way the foregoing questions will be still more fully answered, the brief replies already made more fully explained, and possibly points of agreement may be discovered. I think they can be.

The first error seems to be that of holding that general war is imminent, in a real sense threatening in the near future.

Virtually all qualified observers with whom I have talked testify to the opposite, for very specific and cogent reasons, not because they do not want it that way, or because they imagine it is that way.

For example, what has been done in the Spanish case alone should be sufficiently enlightening to dispel the idea that everybody is looking for war, to go to war.

Any attempt to stampede opinion in this country by cultivating panic and hysteria seems

to me to be unjustified by the facts. Incidentally, the most important single factor which has overcome the danger of war in Europe, which did exist last spring, in my judgment, is British rearmament.

Similarly, a feeling in Germany and Italy that the United States, itself rearming somewhat, would probably be found supporting the cause of peace and order has in all probability had its effect also.

I infer this from the expressions in Rome and Berlin concerning mandatory neutrality legislation in this country. The possibility of such legislation was enthusiastically received, and the possibility of its being defeated was somewhat of a disillusion.

The second error lies in believing that any program of neutrality legislation short of something like national suicide, both spiritual as well as material, could give assurance of keeping the country out of war, or the consequences of war on the world situation.

What would have to be surrendered in material interests alone has been fairly well brought out by various student commentators, in



hearings in Washington, and in our periodical press; but probably not even yet to its full extent, because such a program would involve withdrawing protection from the property and the lives of citizens in foreign countries, to such an extent that we would be thrown back to a medieval situation where intercourse between nations, or among the citizens of different countries, was a rare situation.

On the spiritual side, it would mean a combination of lack of self-respect and irresponsibility, which would rot the soul of the nation if it were ever really adopted.

The moment you give up the protection of citizens abroad, you are very likely to throw the situation back to where it was before that was developed.

Even then there would be no assurance of safety from involvement in the war itself, let alone its repercussions.

The third error lies in carelessly or deliberately confusing international police action with war, and arrangements for such action with actual hostilities. Granted, that if international

police action were to be taken on a large scale and is resisted, the result will physically and externally resemble war completely. Even in that case, however, to equate the action to check aggression with that aggression itself seems a strange sort of reasoning, and a stranger sort of ethics.

What is more important still, the establishment of arrangements for police action in a way to assure that they will be employed when action arises would almost certainly render unnecessary their use.

Unless one is willing to say that he is willing to permit any kind of aggression rather than contemplate the ultimate possibility of actual sanctions action, he should at least be willing to provide the pressure of such sanctions in their potential form. There is no need to exaggerate the ease with which such a system can be established, or its probable effectiveness. It is difficult, dangerous, and at least hypothetically capable of failure.

But nothing else gives any kind of prospect of success. Even if one were willing to sacrifice loss of territory - one's own or someone

else's - for the sake of peace, peace could not be bought in that manner short of complete surrender to the forces of nationalist imperialism, wherever it happens to be.

This leads to the fourth and final error in the Emergency Peace Campaign program, namely, that by a constant process of reshuffling territories and resources by voluntary agreement, countries like Germany and Italy can be satisfied.

This Utopian idea takes the form of criticising the existing system of the League of Nations, for not satisfying the so-called "have-not" powers by revision of the peace treaties, which are blamed for all the alleged misery of Germany, Italy and Japan today.

The last argument is, I submit with all due respect, almost one hundred per cent nonsense. Japan and Italy benefited by the treaties of 1919-20, and have no demands to make for their revision.

Japan and Italy likewise have acquired added territories in recent years and months without ever having any noticeable effect on their foreign policies.

If such difficulties explain the policies



of these countries, how explain their unremitting big-family propaganda likewise? The former, moreover, has enjoyed a period of great prosperity in recent years, while other nations were wallowing in the depression - and just precisely because of her lack of surplus raw materials and foodstuffs, the slump in which was the main feature of the depression, stood her in good stead here. And today she virtually feeds her own greatly expanded population from her own soil, and this on a steadily rising standard of living.

It is also fairly clear that neither Italy nor Germany could derive benefit from colonies, new or old, in any case, either for settlement purposes or as sources of raw materials. There were only fifteen thousand Germans in all her African colonies in 1914, and none of the raw materials she needs comes from Africa.

Only as sources of native troops, as military bases, or as pawns in the political game would they be of much value.

Barriers to the purchase of such materials elsewhere - in the form of quotas e.g. - are insignificant today, and if Germany and Italy lack

financial power to purchase that, it is chiefly due to trade restrictions and financial practices which they have been the leaders in establishing.

Germany's inflationary escapades in the twenties prevented her from going off gold in 1931, and brought on her present plight intensified by deliberate adoption of autarchistic economic policy.

From 1920 to 1930 she recovered faster than any other large European country - in 1930 she was driving the British from their own colonial markets - and this while reparations charges were still in operation, the colonies gone, and all the fetters of the Treaty of Versailles in full force regarding the Saar and the Rhineland, disarmament and everything else.

Incidentally, how explain her pacific mood changes in spite of her injuries?

To go further back, her attitude and activity were still more aggressive in 1914 when she had all her colonies and armed forces and navy, and economic prosperity unimpaired, than they are now.

As a matter of fact, Germany profits more from her former colonies today than she did in 1914.

Many other phases could be recited to show that those countries are either not worse off than the so-called possessing countries, or are worse off through their own doing - thus Dr. Goebbels recently admitted in public address that German re-armament had not been provoked by any external danger -, or could not be helped greatly by revisionist steps on the part of others in any case.

The fact is that Italy and Germany at least do not really seem to want or demand such actions.

Italy both in the Ethiopian case and since has scorned to seek remedies for her difficulties through international cooperation. Baron Aloisi said as much to the League Council on the 4th of September, 1935, and without withdrawing from membership Italy has refused to work with the League ever since, and has explicitly denounced all that sort of thing.

Germany never invoked Article XIX at Geneva, recently refused to take part in League raw materials meetings, and her writers and political spokesmen are busy today building up a complete theory denying the force of international law, the fallacy of international organization, and of



everything except racial nationalism.

The main point of the whole problem lies just here: No matter what the economic or political problems to be solved, or the merits or demerits of the case of this, that, or the other nation, the whole point is that they shall be dealt with by free inquiry, free discussion, and free agreement.

This, as a type of method, is just what the dictatorships dislike and explicitly repudiate.

To hope for elimination of international difficulties by this method alone, and without making it clear that attempts to seize economic or territorial advantage by unilateral violent action will be prevented by force if need be, is to live in a dream.

Sometimes it seems that those, who, out of opposition of sanctions in the covenant and disapproval of the injustices alleged to have been done to Germany in the Treaty of Versailles, blocked the entrance of the United States into the League and thus caused the subsequent collapse of League police action, and revision, would almost approve recourse to violence on the part of the supposedly victimized nations to secure justice.

If so it must be argued on the contrary that it is not enough to disapprove recourse to violence for selfish aggrandizement: One must also disapprove of its use for seeking justice; the one place the word violence has any use in social life is in the hands of the community, to suppress private violence - which can never be met effectively except in its own terms - and thus to facilitate and encourage peaceful change.

This is another relationship misunderstood by most students of the problem. Revision - which is an essential, and indeed the creative element in all social organizations - is not contrary to security but rests on security. Reconsideration of rights and peaceful change can be contemplated with equanimity only if it is known that whatever rights are admitted to be sound will be protected.

Revision, like disarmament, was fatally undermined when the League security system was sabotaged in 1920 and 1924. But that guarantee element must be there, - the system must be complete, or none of the other parts can be expected to work either.

Hence the choice is not between war and peace by revision but between war and peace by security with revision, or in short between war and orderly international government.

What conclusions are to be drawn from this analysis?

First, that the problem should be studied carefully, in its fundamentals, and not given a hasty or makeshift treatment holding out false hopes of peace. No over-simplification of the problem, or trick panaceas or cure-alls can meet the needs of this situation.

The international situation is serious, heaven knows, and American interest in it is tremendous, both materially and spiritually. But for those very reasons the solution adopted must be genuine and creative and not negative and unsound.

Second, that the causes for the present dangerous international situation lie not in the faults of the already much revised peace treaties of 1919-20, however easy it might have been for demagogues - not only in Germany - to misrepresent the situation and blame the Treaty of Versailles for everything, nor in lack of colonies and raw



materials on the part of Germany, Italy or Japan, nor in commercial restrictions applied to these countries by others.

The first are negligible in importance, the second entirely inconclusive, and the third self-inflicted.

What is needed is a general reconsideration of all these problems with a view to getting back to normal international exchange, and away from unsound policies of autarchy.

In the colonial field what is needed is not restriction of Germany colonies but possibly conferring colonial mandates upon her (with sufficient guarantees concerning racial questions), and extension of the mandate system generally.

Third, that the chief danger does lie in the anti-nationalist doctrines put forward in Rome and Berlin to the frankly and violently reactionary views on war and peace and international organization generally which are preached by Mussolini and Hitler today.

Not that these theories mean necessarily an intent to go to war soon, - and the professions of peaceful intent which accompany them may be

taken at not less but more than their face value. But they did wreck the possibilities of organized international cooperation, which is a larger matter than peace itself, and comprises it, and they create an atmosphere in which untoward incidents may cause the outbreak of a conflagration which nobody wants.

It is a fair question why such doctrines have appeared in these countries if not because of real economic suffering. Moreover, the true answer throws light on the action necessary by way of meeting these theories.

Why have such theories appeared here and not in other countries which have suffered as much or more?

Why have they appeared here on the heels of a period of prosperity and expansion, on no more provocation than an economic collapse suffered by everybody else or the ambitions of an unusually dynamic personal leader.

Seemingly because of lack of prolonged experience with so-called democratic institutions, and abnormal national sensitiveness traceable in part to late arrival in the international game,

among the ranks of the great powers.

There are, of course, other countries with the same or similar shortcomings, but not possessing power to make them dangerous.

Happily there are also others - perhaps a score - which do not go haywire even in the depths of a depression.

The leaders of the Emergency Peace Campaign might conceivably go even thus far in revising their analysis and their diagnosis. At least they would not object to the thorough study and the co-operative effort to reorganize the world economic situation. They might, however, demur to the idea that the Rome-Berlin axe - or axis is in its ideology the antithesis of sound and promising internationalism, and particularly to my explanation of why this situation has developed as it has.

They would disagree, I grant, with my final conclusion which is that without an effective sanctions system - under the League or some other auspices, a police system in true form of it possibly but certainly in its essential fact - you cannot face up to those doctrines of international anarchy effectively.



What is more, you cannot get from others that reconsideration of territorial and economic arrangements which you desire. The world cannot wait for peace and order until the international injustices are removed, and here as in the local community peace and order must be preserved in spite of the threats for revision by violence, but the very process of peaceful revision and redressment cannot be started without these, either.

This does not necessarily mean the United States entering the League of Nations at once, bag and baggage - or entering the League with all its sanctions intact.

Although I have my own views about the state of opinion in this country on such an issue, I fear that no courageous political leadership in that direction is going to appear until we have suffered still more than we have from international wars and depressions.

Such a solution would be of revolutionary importance on both the problems of security and revision, but it is not imminent nor is it necessary.

What is at least necessary is that this

country refrain from saying - convincingly at least - that it is neutral in the conflict between order and anarchy in the international world.

Let us only not say that we will not lend support, any support, moral, economic, or military, to our co-signatories of the Briand-Kellogg Pact, even when they are engaged in upholding its principles against an aggressor state violating them, and much will be accomplished. Enough, probably, to avoid war and allow us time to prevail upon Italy and Germany to reconsider.

Already they have begun to doubt the entire wisdom of their extreme positions. Already they are participating in Spain, in an experiment in international government - with sanctions, if you please - which makes the League of Nations and its sanctions system look positively old-fashioned.

If they can be brought to see that international organization in general may serve their interests in other situations also, they may be willing to play ball again. But of one thing we can be absolutely certain: No peace program which is based on an analysis distorted by sentiment, and which refuses to recognize the unpleasant

fact that no international system which relies entirely on voluntary cooperation can hope to meet the emergency, any more than (much less than!) any local government can succeed.

(Applause)

THE CHAIRMAN: Whether you agree with Mr. Page or Dr. Potter does not seem to me to be of significance. You recognize the implications in their addresses and in their very vigorous presentation of their points of view which look toward the solution of our problems by reconciliation of controversy and the emergence of some points of agreement.

Perhaps for those of you who choose to remain, the two speakers will be willing to answer some questions, and further amplify what they have said.

Perhaps a good way to start would be to let each one ask the other a question.

I think I will ask first for some questions from the audience, and then if it does not appear to be wholly illuminated we might ask them to ask each other a question.



Have you any questions?

QUESTION: Mr. Chairman, I have a question I would like to direct to Dr. Potter. Doctor, in making your presentation here, why didn't you point out what everybody knows that the world is a family; and that the way you handle the family is not by allowing the children to run riot, but you handle the wilful child, and you handle your family with discipline.

If you point out that truth, doesn't that clear all this rigmarole about doing things by agreement or by disarming, as long as you are fearful of being attacked?

In other words, can't you make them secure when they understand the world is a family and we are in it, whether we want to be in it or not?

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Potter is invited to simplify his position.

DR. POTTER: Well sir, I should say that I did not stress that element, because I had assumed that we all started from that point; that we were all aware of the interlocking relationship of these days, ~~both~~ materially and spiritually, and that

we could assume that without statement.

I do not know whether I should agree that a transfer of the program for family discipline to the international field, to what used to be called the "Family of Nations", would be wholly beneficial.

I am not sufficiently familiar with the success of family discipline. (Laughter)

THE CHAIRMAN: I am going to ask Mr. Page likewise to comment on the question of family discipline.

MR. PAGE: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to comment on that, because it is precisely because I look upon the various members of the human race as members of a family that I have said what I have said.

For surely it is not legitimate for brothers and sisters to let loose upon each other with poison gas and chemicals and all the weapons of modern armed hostility. It is precisely because I believe in the family relation that I oppose all armed action.

I would like to say only one thing in relation to this question of coercion and police force. That is, first, refer briefly to the first decision rendered by the Supreme Court of the United

States in the case of a southern state.

Many of you will remember that case, which was called the Chisholm case. A man named Chisholm sued the State of Georgia for some money, which Mr. Chisholm said the State of Georgia owed him. The case came to the Supreme Court of the United States and the Supreme Court ruled that the State of Georgia owed Mr. Chisholm the money and must pay.

Whereupon the State of Georgia passed a law to the effect that anybody who tried to enforce that decision of the Supreme Court was guilty of a crime and would be hung.

Now the question is, as members of a family what should the Supreme Court have done? One alternative would have been to rely upon armed police power, and they started an armed body of federal troops down to Atlanta.

One objection to that is: We are members of a family, and that is not the way to treat Georgia, and the second objection is, to attempt to do that would produce civil war.

Therefore, what did the Supreme Court actually do? The Supreme Court waited and did not



attempt any punitive action against the State of Georgia. Whereupon the other states sided with Georgia, and we had the eleventh amendment to the Constitution.

I submit it was better for the Supreme Court to have been prescribed than to use punitive methods on the members of the family.

QUESTION: I would like to ask a question of Mr. Page: First, is it certain or even quite logical to assume that the United States would necessarily turn to dictatorship if it should be compelled to go to war?

Is it not true that the United States did, somehow, come through the terrible ordeal of the World War, as did Canada and Australia and England, and other countries, without turning to dictatorship?

At the most, it might be temporary discipline, not complete dictatorship.

The other question is this: Mr. Page seems to advocate the relief of economic tensions as the best way to avoid bringing about a world war, or a war on the part of dictatorial nations. I imagine he assumes that if this tension is re-

lieved, that therefore the people of Germany and Italy will see the error of their ways, and will turn to more democratic government and get rid of dictators. But if that be a fact, will not Hitler and Mussolini be aware of that, and if they are aware will they not scuttle any attempt at relief of economic tensions, because thus their own security would be endangered?

THE CHAIRMAN: The dual question is as follows: Is it not true that the result of war in the United States will not necessarily be an embarrassment to democracy in the United States?

Secondly, can it be assumed that dictators are always disingenuous and will preserve chaos to preserve themselves?

MR. PAGE: With regard to the first question, one condition of course is, if the war is a short war, and the enemy is weak, then what I said would be sharply qualified.

If the war is a long war, and if the United States, or any other government, is hard put to it to win the war, my own opinion is what I have stated; that government will itself be transformed, will have to transform itself into a dictatorship.

I do not have to deal wholly with the realm of theory. You may have heard of a bill called the Hawley-Shepard bill, which is now in congress. There is opposition to it and support for it. What is the essence of the Hawley-Shepard bill? It is to establish what is called "industrial mobilization." And if you will examine the provisions of that bill, you will discover that they propose to establish a dictatorship.

The Hawley-Shepard if passed will be the establishment of a dictatorship. You say: Well, that is temporary. My observation of what has happened in a world that goes to war is illustrated by what happened in Europe, and that leads me to be very apprehensive that the dictatorship would not be temporary but prolonged.

In the early form of the industrial mobilization, as approved by the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War there is a provision that this mobilization shall continue in effect for six months after the President of the United States has declared the emergency over. It does not say six months after the war is over. The bill says in effect six months after the



emergency is over.

I can't be as easy about this as my friend. I think there is plenty of basis for apprehension that something like that will be clamped down on us if we go to war, and that will lead to the establishment of a dictatorship that may not be temporary.

I did not get the essence of the second question, and therefore I am not able to make an intelligent comment.

QUESTION: Isn't your object in advocating the relief of economic tensions, isn't it based on the hope that Germany and Italy will, we assume, get rid of dictators?

They will fear that, and therefore will scuttle or sabotage any attempt at economic relief, because their own existence would be in danger.

MR. PAGE: That the dictatorship can only be prolonged as long as the economic depression; therefore they would not be in favor of relieving the economic depression.

On the other hand, Hitler and Mussolini will know that prolonged economic misery and depression will lead to their undoing. While they

can keep promising and promising for a while, there is a limit beyond which they cannot go. There is not any hope except in the alleviation of economic distress, and the proof is these people keep making promises that their distress is going to be alleviated.

QUESTION: I would like to ask Mr. Potter whether he has not created a false analogy between police power and the application of sanctions.

Under the sanctions of the League of Nations, only the nations are fully armed. With the police power arm, the police have a superior power, whereas war with the nations armed has nobody. The aim of the League of Nations would be destructive of the civilian population on a vast scale, which the police do not do.

Isn't there a fallacy on that point?

THE CHAIRMAN: Is war in the case of a police power as destructive as war of aggression?

DR. POTTER: I think that such a question is perfectly legitimate. It would take a good deal of time for a complete answer.

I said, you may remember in my direct exposition, that externally and physically the

use of joint military action by the states of the League, or any other international organization, particularly if resisted, would amount to war physically.

I have sometimes put it rather flippantly: It would sound like war, look like war, feel like war and all the rest of it.

But I was distinguishing in point of ethical and juridical principles. I submit there is a fundamental difference.

As a matter of fact, I am not so sure that the police always use their force with such great restraint. But waiving that comparison, I am in entire agreement that if such action had to be taken very often, or on any large scale, it would be not as bad as war, but it would be just about. It would not be as bad ethically. It might be as bad practically.

If we cannot make the thing work without having to use sanctions in actual practice, then we will have to fail, but that is the only qualification I would make.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think this symposium has been as illuminating to you as to me.



We will now adjourn with thanks to the  
speakers.

---